

REMARKS

Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 CFR 1.136(a)

It is hereby requested that the term to respond to the Examiner's Action of September 5, 2007 be extended three months, from December 5, 2007 to March 5, 2008.

Authorization to charge a Credit Card is given to cover the extension fee. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 19-5425.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 1 through 16 and 18 are pending in the application and the Examiner rejected all of the claims. By this amendment, claims 1, 4 and 16 have been amended, claims 5 and 18 have been cancelled, and claims 19-33 have been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-16 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,999,808 to LaDue.

The Present Invention

The present invention is directed to a wireless information device that can access betting related services. Among the features of the present invention is web interaction system that automatically links to the web resources, automatically parses their content, and automatically queries their content to locate the best odds.

The Examiner Has Not Established a Prima Facie Case of Obviousness

As set forth in the MPEP:

To support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103, a reason, suggestion, or motivation to lead an inventor to combine two or more references must be found. *Pro-Mold and Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastics Inc.*, 37 U.S.P.Q.2d 1627, 1629 (Fed.Cir. 1996). The Examiner has not met his burden in establishing a reason, suggestion, or motivation for combining the cited references.

The only reference relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims is U.S. Patent No. 5,999,808 to LaDue. LaDue is directed to a method for seamlessly transmitting application specific messages over cellular radio system control channels and switches, and is used for wireless gaming and wagering. However, LaDue is entirely silent on the mechanism by which “best gaming odds” are downloaded to the game caddy. It is therefore entirely silent with respect to the herein-claimed element of on there being any kind of a

“web interaction system [that] automatically links to the web resources, automatically parses their content, and automatically queries their content to locate the best odds.”

There is neither a teaching nor a suggestion of this claimed feature; it is not mentioned at all. Without such a teaching or suggestion, it would not be obvious to the skilled person to use such a web interaction system.

The claimed invention addresses problems of the prior art. There are several technical problems affecting the prior art communications processes that enable a wireless information device to interact with some kind of remote resource that provides betting-related services. One of these is the inherent latency of wireless links; another is the risk of a link being dropped. This risk increases as the length of time of an interaction increases.

The present invention addresses these technical problems by providing a method in which an automated web interaction system automatically links to various web resources, automatically parses their content, and automatically queries their content to locate the best odds and then sends those out to the wireless device for it to display. The device then integrates the display of the best odds with an option to initiate placing a bet.

This minimizes the risk of a link being dropped because it minimizes the number of user interactions needed to reach the relevant information and then place a bet and hence minimizes the time spent connected for a given session. The user no longer has to scroll down long lists of bets to find the best odds; instead, this filtering is done automatically and remotely by the automated web interaction system.

All of the claims include the above-mentioned novel and non-obvious elements. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-4, and 6-16 under 35 USC §103. Applicant submits that all of the pending claims (claims 1-4, 6-16, and 19-33) are now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

The present invention is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims. An early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this communication to applicant's Deposit Account No. 19-5425.

Respectfully submitted

March 5, 2008
Date

/Mark D. Simpson/
Mark D. Simpson, Esquire
Registration No. 32,942

Synnestvedt Lechner & Woodbridge LLP
112 Nassau Street
P.O. Box 592
Princeton, NJ 08542-0592
(609) 924-3773 – Telephone
(609) 924-1811 – Facsimile
MSimpson@sunnlech.com - Email